



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in *Macbeth*, and deducing a conclusion precisely the opposite of Lanier's?

At their best, on the other hand, the comparisons are well worth making. It may seem somewhat startling at first to be asked to compare St. Juliana with Miss Gwendolen Harleth; but the device enables the author to enforce some very real likenesses between mediæval life and the life of the nineteenth century portrayed in *Daniel Deronda*: 'May it not be that they [people in 2879] will think Mrs. Lewes's story as foolish as you think Cynewulf's? . . . The truth is, when all's said and done, the devil who appeared to Juliana and urged her to worship the false gods was not one whit more superstitious or ridiculous than the arguments by which Gwendolen Harleth persuaded herself to marry Grandcourt. The one belongs as much to an age of darkness as the other' (1. 108-09). After all, before the worth of Old English literature can be said to have been duly tested, it must have been subjected to a searching comparison with other literatures; in so far as the chapters here discussed succeed in showing us a practicable method of relating our mediæval literature to our modern, they are not without a real value.

CHAUNCEY B. TINKER.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers, Second Series.

Edited with the Latin Originals, Index of Biblical Passages, and Index of Principal Words, by Albert S. Cook, Ph. D., L. H. D., Professor of the English Language and Literature in Yale University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; London: Edward Arnold, 1903. Pp. x, 396.

Students of Old English will be gratified to note the completion of Professor Cook's great collection of *Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers*, the first part of which appeared in 1898. In its scope and method the second series follows the same lines as the first, so as to dispense us from a description of its general arrangement. The texts included in the present volume are (1) the remaining works of the Alfred cycle, namely the *Boethius*, Augustine's *Soliloquies* (quoted from Hargrove's edition of 1902), Gregory's *Dialogues* (made accessible through the Johnson-Hecht edition of

1900); (2) the chief works of Ælfric outside the *Homilies* (and the *Heptateuch*, of course), namely the *Lives of Saints*, *Interrogationes Sigewulfi*, *Hexameron* and *Admonitio*, the *Colloquy*, and the extensive supplements to Thorpe's edition of the *Homilies* which have been published by Napier; (3) various books of homilies, the Blickling collection, the Wulfstan series, the *Homilies and Saints' Lives* of Assmann's edition; further, the *Benedictine Rule*, *Benedictine Office*, *Martyrology* (edited by Herzfeld), *Harrowing of Hell* (Bright's text), *Solomon and Saturn*, and the *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*. Some of these works have been laid under heavy contribution, for example Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*, with thirty-eight pages; the *Blickling Homilies* and Wulfstan's *Homilies*, with upwards of twenty pages each; and Napier's 'Supplement to Ælfric's *Homilies*' consists in fact of unmixed Gospel extracts. On the other hand, the material gathered from texts like the *Colloquy* or *Boethius* is naturally very scanty, though of a decidedly interesting character. To the four Biblical allusions in *Boethius* we might, by the way, add: *þā bēoð þēre heofencundan Ierusalem burgware* 11. 17 (Hebr. 12. 22, Rev. 21. 2, 10),—an insertion based on a Latin commentary, to which also the mention of the 'divisio linguarum' 99. 16 f. has been referred (Schepss, *Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 94. 150, 152; cf. Sedgfield's edition, p. xxxi ff.).¹

Also a couple of quotations from the Chronicle are perhaps worth mentioning in this place: *swā hē sylf on his godspelle sæið, þæt furðon ān spearwa on gryn ne mæg befeallan forūtan his forescēawunge* A. D. 1067 D. (rather free, compared with Matth. 10. 29 (cf. Ps. 124. 7. ?); see Cook, p. 204). *Be þām se apostol Paulus, ealra þēoda lārēow, cwæð: Salvabitur* (Vulg.: sanctificatus est enim) *vir infidelis per mulierem fidelem; sic et* (Vulg.: et sanctificata est) *mulier infidelis per virum fidelem, et rel. þæt is on ūran gepēode: ful oft se ungelēaffī. 'Ia wer bið gehālgad and gehæled þurh þæt rihtwīse (lēaffule ab. 1.) wīf, and swā gelīce þæt wīf þurh gelēaffulne wer. ib. (I. Cor. 7. 14).*

Great care has been exercised by the editor in tracing the sources of the Scriptural passages. Those of the Latin originals which differ from the Vulgate text have been marked as such, even very slight deviations being considered. In a number of instances the variants have apparently been furnished by the Latin quotations scattered through the Old English texts themselves, as in the

¹ A convenient list of Biblical and Christian additions has been printed in the Introduction to Sedgfield's translation, p. xxxi.

Blickling Homilies, Ælfric's *Saints*, Wulfstan's *Homilies*, the *Soliloquies*, and Assmann's miscellaneous collection. Whether an investigation of the sources of Ælfric's *Saints* and the *Blickling Homilies* along the lines opened up by Ott (*Über die Quellen der Heiligenleben in Ælfrics Lives of Saints*. I. Halle, 1892) and Förster (*Archiv für das Studium der Neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 91. 179–206) would have yielded fruitful results, we have no means here of ascertaining.¹ Certainly the difficulty of finding out the exact forms of the originals is very considerable. It is an encouraging event to chronicle that recently a study of the West Saxon Gospels has been undertaken with especial reference to the form of the Latin text (L. M. Harris, *Studies in the Anglo-Saxon Version of the Gospels*. Part I. Baltimore, 1901).

To the body of the book three Appendices have been added: the Cambridge Fragment of Genesis discovered by Professor Frank H. Chase; an Index of Biblical references in the Durham Ritual; and full tables of Parallel Passages from the Gospels, arranged in the manner of a Harmony (pp. 219–304). Comparative studies, to which the latter naturally invite, are moreover facilitated by the exhaustive Index of Biblical Passages. By the use of this Index, together with the corresponding one in the first volume, we are enabled in the most convenient manner to set side by side different renderings of the same verse or verses. For example, we find Matth. 11. 29 represented in four texts: Bede 100. 26 f., *Blickl. Hom.* 13. 18 f., Ælfr. *Hom.* I. 210. 17 f., Ælfr. *L. S.* I 344. 124 f.; Luke 21. 34 in: *Cur. P.* 128. 19 f., Ælfr. *Hom.* II 22. 17 ff., *Ben. R.* 64. 1 f., Assm. *Hom.* 141. 78 f., *WS. Gosp.*; Is. 58. 1 in: *Cur. P.* 90. 18 f., Ælfr. *Hom.* I 6. 31 ff., Wulfst. 6. 8 f., 283. 1 f., *Inst.* 434, Assm. *Hom.* 138. 9 f.; Is. 58. 7 in: *Cur. P.* 314. 13 ff., Ælfr. *Hom.* I 180. 4 ff., *Blickl. Hom.* 37. 20 ff., Assm. *Hom.* 141. 93 ff.; Ps. 96. 5 (*omnes dii gentium daemonia; Dominus autem caelos fecit*) twice in Ælfr. *L. S.*, I 26. 39 f., I 308. 18 f. (with which places may be compared the erroneous interpretation in *Gnom. Exon.* 133: *Woden worhte wēos, wuldor Alwalda, / rūme roderas*, cf. *Zeitschrift für Deutsches Altertum* 31. 59); and, to instance a connected passage, Luke 10. 38–42 is found in two renderings by Ælfric, *Hom.* II

¹*Blickl. Hom.* 91. 23, *ond sēo rōd ūres Drihtnes bið āræred on þæt gewizle þara tungla*, is rather far removed from Matth. 24. 30: *et tunc parebit signum Filii hominis in caelo*. Morris's translation: 'and the Rood of our Lord . . . shall be raised in the course of the stars' is ambiguous. We can hardly go wrong in regarding on *þæt gewizle* as a gloss of an 'in vicem.'

438. 30 ff. and Suppl. (*Archiv* 102.39), and in *Blickl. Hom.* 67. 25 ff. (with some interesting variations).

A very valuable part of the volume is the excellent Glossary (pp. 347–392), which records all occurrences of most of the Old English words, only some very common vocables being omitted. A few inadvertencies, some of them affecting also the texts, may be noted.

āwegan should be changed to *āwēgan* = *āwēgan*; it occurs in *Ælfr. Hom.* (Suppl., Cook, p. 154): *nolde, þēah, for his āðe . . . his word āwegan*. Cf. *Ælfric*, Judges 15. 19: *ān stæf ne bið nē ān strica āwāged of þære ealdan gesetnisse*; *Andreas* 1439: *ær āwāged sie worda ænig*.

Under *bodian*, the reference to 95. 6 is to be stricken out; (*nē wundorlice mid getote ne*) *bōde*, *Ben. R.* 22. 17, belongs to **bōian* (**bōgan*).

brædan, 58. 20, is distinct from *brædan*, 173. 1 (*gebrædne fisc*); with the latter belongs *brædan* 19. 16 (Glossary s. v. *gebrædan*).

gēara 56. 2. Rather *geara*, as the context shows: *ēow sōna wyrc heofona rīces duru geara untýned* *Wulfst.* 71. 15.

From *hýra*, 175. 19 ff. (= *mercenarius*), is to be separated *hýra* 'hearer, one who obeys,' 102. 11: *þæne glædan hýran God lufað*, *Ben. R.* 20. 24 = *hilarem datorem diligit Deus*. The peculiar rendering *hýran*, which would almost seem to point to an 'auditorum' in place of 'datorem' (*Benet* 25. 6 *syllan*, *Wintaney* version 29. 11 *gefestre*), could nevertheless be accounted for by the context.

weg in *rihtwisnyse weg wuldorbēah* (p. 216, *Ælfr. L. S.* II 352. 290) should be canceled, as *Skeat* suggests.

A few gleanings from the quotations of the Latin originals may be subjoined. P. 59. *Matth.* 24. 24: *et prodigia* is to be left out. P. 84. *Matth.* 22. 39 (*Mark* 12. 31, *Rom.* 13. 9, cf. *Luke* 10. 27) is nearer to *Solil.* 19. 8 f.: *þæt man sceole lufian hys nēhstan swā swā hyne sylfne* than *Lev.* 19. 18. P. 111. *Is.* 9. 6: The proper reading is no doubt: *et filius datus est nobis*. It seems that 'filius' is abbreviated in the MS. P. 199. *Ps.* 91. 7: Read *tibi*, instead of *ad te*. P. 207. *John* 5. 25: *Ælfric's* Latin text has (*Fili*) *hominis*, not *Dei*; and omits *et nunc est*. P. 215. *Gal.* 5. 19: Read *impudicitia* (rendered, in a somewhat remarkable fashion, by *estfulmyss*).

The two stately volumes of Professor Cook's *Biblical Quotations* are a splendid monument of persevering enthusiasm and scholarship. They cover nearly the entire prose of the period, and will thus prove of the highest value to the student of the Old English language and

literature. It is also hoped that they will act as a stimulant in promoting further special studies. The new volume is one of the series issued in connection with the Yale Bicentennial Anniversary, and its magnificent typographical make-up testifies to the festival occasion of its publication.

FR. KLAEBER.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.